

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed June 27, 2005, claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-16, 19 and 20 were rejected. Applicants have thoroughly reviewed the outstanding Office Action including the Examiner's remarks and the references cited therein. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action. All the pending claims at issue are believed to be patentable over the cited references.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-16, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner stated that the claims contained subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, has possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, the Examiner stated that Claims 1, 9, and 16 recite the newly added limitation wherein the rotatable restricting means is rotated so that the restricting device can not pass through the plurality of slots. Such limitation is considered new matter since the specification and the drawings, as originally filed, do not show, disclose, or suggest the restricting means must be rotated to prohibit the movement in an axial direction. Without conceding the propriety of the Examiner's rejection, the Applicants have amended claims 1, 9, and 16 to remove the rotatable restricting means. The Applicants believe that the claims in their current form are allowable because the prior art does not show at least the sizing of the second end of said first elongated portion and the first end of said second elongated member prevents the second end of said first elongated member from passing through the first

Docket No.: 87345.1640
Application No.: 09/911,288
Customer No.: 30734

end of said second elongated member. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner allow the claims presented herein.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. If it is believed that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney if it is believed that such contact will expedite the prosecution of the application.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, Applicants petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fee deficiencies or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2036, referencing 87345.1640.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP



Phong D. Nguyen
Registration No. 43,833

Date: September 26, 2005
Washington Square, Suite 1100
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-5304
Telephone: 202-861-1561
Facsimile: 202-861-1783